

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of November 17, 2004 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

By the above actions, claims 1-33 have been amended and claims 3, 9, 15 and 21 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33 are pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 28 and 31 are independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, the specification contains informalities because specific reference to the prior application is not included in the first sentence of the specification. In response, Applicants have amended the specification, as shown above, to include cross-reference to a related application.

The Examiner states in Section 2, page 2, of the Office Action that the IDS' submitted on January 20, 2004 and October 9, 2003 contain the same references. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner is correct, and Applicants appreciate the thoroughness of the Examiner's work.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as the Examiner contends that (a) the organic semiconductor film having a thickness thicker than that of the second insulating film, as recited in claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, is not shown in the drawings; and (b) a second and third electrode are not shown in the drawings. Further, the specification stands objected to as failing to provide support for features recited in claims 3, 9, 15 and 21. Still further, claims 3, 9, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, as shown above. Incidentally, the descriptions of the second and third electrodes (the source and drain electrodes) are supported in page 6, lines 4-7. In view of the actions above, the objections and rejections in relation to claims 3, 9, 15 and 21 are rendered moot.

Further, the Examiner contends that reference numerals in Fig. 1 are not consistent with those used in Figs. 2C, 2D and 2E. In response, Applicants are submitting drawing corrections as shown in the attached Replacement Sheets. Specifically, Applicants have corrected Fig. 1 so that the reference numerals are consistent with those used in Figs. 2C-2E.

Additionally, Applicants have corrected Fig. 2E so that the reference numerals 108 and 109 indicate a second electrode (a source electrode) and a third electrode (a drain electrode), respectively.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,988 B1 – hereafter Ishihara). In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended all pending independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 28 and 31 to recite that a top surface of the organic semiconductor film is in alignment with a top surface of the second insulating film. This amendment further clarifies the structural characteristic of the present invention and is supported in, e.g., Fig. 2.

In contrast with the amended claims, Fig. 1(a) of Ishihara discloses top surfaces of the organic semiconductor films 107, 108 and 109 as separated from a top surface of the second insulated film 106. Therefore, Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in all pending independent claims and their respective dependent claims, distinguishes over that of Ishihara.

Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claims is not taught (and is not inherent) in the teachings of Ishihara, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as anticipated by Ishihara is improper.

In addition to amending all pending independent claims as discussed above, all pending dependent claims have been amended to provide a consistency in the language usage in the preamble of the dependent claims and their respective independent claims.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace Fig. 1 and Figs. 2A-2E with the attachment replacement sheets.